

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Support for amended Claims 1 and 7 is found, for example, at specification page 5, lines 21-31.

No new matter is added.

Applicants thank Examiner Wilson for indicating that Claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome all formal requirements or specifically traverse each requirement not complied with, set forth in this Office action, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The specification objection is mooted by submission, along with this paper, of a substitute Abstract.

The objection to Claims 1 and 7 is obviated by amendment of Claims 1 and 7 to specify R¹ to R⁵ in the formula (I'). Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

The anticipation rejection of Claims 1 and 3 as being unpatentable in view of Wu is traversed. Wu discloses C3-symmetry graphite discs which are obtained from branched hydrocarbon propellers (see, for example, page 5183 of Wu). Wu does not describe or suggest the fluoranthene of present Claim 1 wherein X is an alkyl radical or a radical of formula (I') or an oligophenyl group. Compound 12 of Wu, cited in the Official Action at page 5, cannot anticipate the fluoranthene of present Claim 1 because, for example, for this to be the case, X in present Claim 1 must be able to be phenyl, and X cannot be phenyl in present Claim 1. Withdrawal of the anticipation rejection is requested.

The anticipation rejection of Claims 1, 3, 7-9 and 11-13 as being unpatentable in view of Kitamoto is traversed. Kitamoto is drawn to organic electroluminescence devices. 7, 10-diphenyl-8-(4'phenylphenyl)fluoranthene (compound 108) on page 76 of Kitamoto, cited by the Office at page 5 of the Official Action, cannot anticipate present Claims 1 and 7 and the claims depending therefrom because, in order for this compound to anticipate, X would have

to be capable of being phenyl in present Claims 1 and 7, and X cannot be phenyl in these claims. Withdrawal of the anticipation rejection is requested.

The obviousness rejection of Claims 10 and 14-21 as being unpatentable in view of Kitamoto and Nishi is traversed. Claims 10 and 14-21 depend, indirectly, from Claim 1. As described, *supra*, Kitamoto does not describe or suggest at least the radical X feature of present Claim 1. Nishi, whom the Office relies upon to provide use of light emitting diodes in televisions, mobile phones, laptops, or vehicles (see page 6 of the Official Action) does not remedy the deficiency of Kitamoto. Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is requested.

The obviousness rejection of Claims 1, 3, 7-9 and 11-13 as being unpatentable in view of Cho is traversed. Cho does not describe or suggest at least the radical X feature of present Claims 1 and 11 and the claims depending therefrom. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The obviousness rejection of Claims 10 and 14-21 as being unpatentable in view of Cho and Nishi is traversed. Claims 10 and 14-21 depend, indirectly, from present Claim 1. As described, *supra*, Cho does not describe or suggest at least the radical X feature of present Claim 1. Nishi, whom the Office relies upon to provide use of light emitting diodes in televisions, mobile phones, laptops, or vehicles (see page 6 of the Official Action) does not remedy the deficiency of Cho. Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is requested.

Application No. 10/573,803
Reply to Office Action of July 30, 2009

Applicants submit the present application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.
Norman F. Oblon



Charles J. Andres, Jr., Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 57,537

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 07/09)